

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
10 AT RICHLAND

11 ADAM FRANCHI, Individually and On
12 Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 KEY TECHNOLOGY, INC., RICHARD
16 LAWRENCE, ROBERT M. AVERICK,
17 JOHN J. EHREN, JOHN E. PELO,
18 MICHAEL L. SHANNON, CHARLES H.
19 STONECIPHER, DONALD A.
20 WASHBURN, PAUL J. WOLF,
DURAVANT LLC, and CASCADE
MERGER SUB, INC.,

Defendants.

NO. 4:18-cv-5027

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

21 **COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATION OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934**

22 Plaintiff, by his undersigned attorneys, for this complaint against defendants,
23 alleges upon personal knowledge with respect to himself, and upon information and
24 belief based upon, *inter alia*, the investigation of counsel as to all other allegations
25 herein, as follows:

26 **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

27 1. This action stems from a proposed transaction announced on January

25, 2018 (the “Proposed Transaction”), pursuant to which Key Technology, Inc. (“Key Technology” or the “Company”) will be acquired by Duravant LLC (“Parent”) and its wholly-owned subsidiary, Cascade Merger Sub, Inc. (“Merger Sub,” and together with Parent, “Duravant”).

2. On January 25, 2018, Key Technology’s Board of Directors (the “Board” or “Individual Defendants”) caused the Company to enter into an agreement and plan of merger (the “Merger Agreement”) with Duravant. Pursuant to the terms of the Merger Agreement, Merger Sub commenced a tender offer, which is scheduled to expire on March 8, 2018, to acquire all of the Company’s outstanding shares of common stock for \$26.75 per share in cash.

3. On February 8, 2018, defendants filed a Solicitation/Recommendation Statement (the “Solicitation Statement”) with the United States Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) in connection with the Proposed Transaction.

4. The Solicitation Statement omits material information with respect to the Proposed Transaction, which renders the Solicitation Statement false and misleading. Accordingly, plaintiff alleges herein that defendants violated Sections 14(e), 14(d), and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the “1934 Act”) in connection with the Solicitation Statement.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

5. This Court has jurisdiction over all claims asserted herein pursuant to Section 27 of the 1934 Act because the claims asserted herein arise under Sections 14(e), 14(d), and 20(a) of the 1934 Act and Rule 14a-9.

6. This Court has jurisdiction over defendants because each defendant is either a corporation that conducts business in and maintains operations within this District, or is an individual with sufficient minimum contacts with this District so as to make the exercise of jurisdiction by this Court permissible under traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.

1 the Merger Agreement.

2 20. Defendant Merger Sub is a Delaware corporation, a wholly-owned
3 subsidiary of Parent, and a party to the Merger Agreement.

4 **CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**

5 21. Plaintiff brings this action as a class action on behalf of himself and the
6 other public stockholders of Key Technology (the "Class"). Excluded from the Class
7 are defendants herein and any person, firm, trust, corporation, or other entity related to
8 or affiliated with any defendant.

9 22. This action is properly maintainable as a class action.

10 23. The Class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable.
11 As of January 25, 2018, there were 6,464,790 shares of Key Technology common
12 stock outstanding, held by hundreds, if not thousands, of individuals and entities
13 scattered throughout the country.

14 24. Questions of law and fact are common to the Class, including, among
15 others: (i) whether defendants violated the 1934 Act; and (ii) whether defendants will
16 irreparably harm plaintiff and the other members of the Class if defendants' conduct
17 complained of herein continues.

18 25. Plaintiff is committed to prosecuting this action and has retained
19 competent counsel experienced in litigation of this nature. Plaintiff's claims are typical
20 of the claims of the other members of the Class and plaintiff has the same interests as
21 the other members of the Class. Accordingly, plaintiff is an adequate representative of
22 the Class and will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the Class.

23 26. The prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the Class
24 would create the risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications that would establish
25 incompatible standards of conduct for defendants, or adjudications that would, as a
26 practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of individual members of the Class who
27 are not parties to the adjudications or would substantially impair or impede those non-

1 party Class members' ability to protect their interests.

2 27. Defendants have acted, or refused to act, on grounds generally
3 applicable to the Class as a whole, and are causing injury to the entire Class.
4 Therefore, final injunctive relief on behalf of the Class is appropriate.

5 **SUBSTANTIVE ALLEGATIONS**

6 ***Background of the Company and the Proposed Transaction***

7 28. Key Technology, founded in 1948, is the trusted partner to over 3,100
8 customers in 81 countries, providing process automation systems for the food
9 processing and other non-food processing industries.

10 29. The Company develops and manufactures automated digital sorting
11 systems and integrates them with its advanced material handling technologies to
12 provide complete solutions for processors of food and other processed products.

13 30. Key Technology's digital sorting solutions utilize a wide array of sensor
14 technologies, including multi-spectral lasers, color and infrared cameras, and
15 hyperspectral technology. Sensor data is analyzed through specialized processing
16 applications, leveraging the Company's proprietary software and algorithms. This data
17 is used to intelligently identify and remove defects and foreign materials, and manage
18 product characteristics to maximize customer product quality and increase their
19 process yields.

20 31. On January 25, 2018, the Individual Defendants caused the Company to
21 enter into the Merger Agreement with Duravant.

22 32. Pursuant to the terms of the Merger Agreement, Duravant commenced a
23 tender offer to acquire all of the Company's outstanding shares of common stock for
24 \$26.75 per share in cash.

25 ***The Solicitation Statement Omits Material Information, Rendering It False and***
26 ***Misleading***

27 33. On February 8, 2018, defendants filed the Solicitation Statement with the

1 SEC in connection with the Proposed Transaction.

2 34. The Solicitation Statement omits material information regarding the
3 Proposed Transaction, which renders the Solicitation Statement false and misleading.

4 35. First, the Solicitation Statement omits material information regarding the
5 Company's financial projections and the valuation analyses performed by the
6 Company's financial advisor in connection with the Proposed Transaction, Robert W.
7 Baird & Co. Incorporated ("Baird").

8 36. The disclosure of projected financial information is material because it
9 provides stockholders with a basis to project the future financial performance of a
10 company, and allows stockholders to better understand the financial analyses
11 performed by the company's financial advisor in support of its fairness opinion.
12 Moreover, when a banker's endorsement of the fairness of a transaction is touted to
13 shareholders, the valuation methods used to arrive at that opinion as well as the key
14 inputs and range of ultimate values generated by those analyses must also be fairly
15 disclosed.

16 37. With respect to the Company's financial projections, the Solicitation
17 Statement fails to disclose: (i) taxes/tax rate; (ii) interest; (iii) net income; (iv) non-
18 recurring and one-time expenses; and (v) a reconciliation of all non-GAAP to GAAP
19 metrics.

20 38. With respect to Baird's *Discounted Cash Flow Analysis*, the Solicitation
21 Statement fails to disclose: (i) Baird's basis for assuming terminal values ranging from
22 9.0x to 10.0x 2020 Adjusted EBITDA; and (ii) the specific inputs and assumptions
23 underlying the discount rate range of 15% to 16%.

24 39. Second, the Solicitation Statement fails to disclose whether any non-
25 disclosure agreements executed by the Company and the prospective bidders
26 contained standstill and/or "don't ask, don't waive" provisions that are or were
27 preventing those counterparties from submitting superior offers to acquire the

1 Company.

2 40. Without this information, stockholders may have the mistaken belief that,
3 if these potentially interested parties wished to come forward with a superior offer, they
4 are or were permitted to do so, when in fact they are or were contractually prohibited
5 from doing so.

6 41. Third, the Solicitation Statement omits material information regarding
7 potential conflicts of interest of the Company's officers and directors.

8 42. Specifically, the Solicitation Statement fails to disclose the timing and
9 nature of all communications regarding future employment and directorship of the
10 Company's officers and directors, as well as the payment of transaction bonuses,
11 including who participated in all such communications.

12 43. Communications regarding post-transaction employment during the
13 negotiation of the underlying transaction must be disclosed to stockholders. This
14 information is necessary for stockholders to understand potential conflicts of interest of
15 management and the Board, as that information provides illumination concerning
16 motivations that would prevent fiduciaries from acting solely in the best interests of the
17 Company's stockholders.

18 44. The omission of the above-referenced material information renders the
19 Solicitation Statement false and misleading, including the "Solicitation or
20 Recommendation" section of the Solicitation Statement.

21 45. The above-referenced omitted information, if disclosed, would
22 significantly alter the total mix of information available to the Company's stockholders.

23 **COUNT I**

24 **(Claim for Violation of Section 14(e) of the 1934 Act Against Defendants)**

25 46. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the preceding allegations as if fully set
26 forth herein.

27 47. Section 14(e) of the 1934 Act states, in relevant part, that:

1 It shall be unlawful for any person to make any untrue statement of a
2 material fact or omit to state any material fact necessary in order to make
3 the statements made, in the light of the circumstances under which they
are made, not misleading . . . in connection with any tender offer or
request or invitation for tenders[.]

4 48. Defendants disseminated the misleading Solicitation Statement, which
5 contained statements that, in violation of Section 14(e) of the 1934 Act, in light of the
6 circumstances under which they were made, omitted to state material facts necessary
7 to make the statements therein not misleading.

8 49. The Solicitation Statement was prepared, reviewed, and/or disseminated
9 by defendants.

10 50. The Solicitation Statement misrepresented and/or omitted material facts
11 in connection with the Proposed Transaction as set forth above.

12 51. By virtue of their positions within the Company and/or roles in the
13 process and the preparation of the Solicitation Statement, defendants were aware of
14 this information and their duty to disclose this information in the Solicitation Statement.

15 52. The omissions in the Solicitation Statement are material in that a
16 reasonable shareholder will consider them important in deciding whether to tender
17 their shares in connection with the Proposed Transaction. In addition, a reasonable
18 investor will view a full and accurate disclosure as significantly altering the total mix of
19 information made available.

20 53. Defendants knowingly or with deliberate recklessness omitted the
21 material information identified above in the Solicitation Statement, causing statements
22 therein to be materially incomplete and misleading.

23 54. By reason of the foregoing, defendants violated Section 14(e) of the
24 1934 Act.

25 55. Because of the false and misleading statements in the Solicitation
26 Statement, plaintiff and the Class are threatened with irreparable harm.

27 56. Plaintiff and the Class have no adequate remedy at law.

COUNT II

(Claim for Violation of 14(d) of the 1934 Act Against Defendants)

57. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the preceding allegations as if fully set forth herein.

58. Section 14(d)(4) of the 1934 Act states:

Any solicitation or recommendation to the holders of such a security to accept or reject a tender offer or request or invitation for tenders shall be made in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe as necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of investors.

59. Rule 14d-9(d) states, in relevant part:

Any solicitation or recommendation to holders of a class of securities referred to in section 14(d)(1) of the Act with respect to a tender offer for such securities shall include the name of the person making such solicitation or recommendation and the information required by Items 1 through 8 of Schedule 14D-9 (§ 240.14d-101) or a fair and adequate summary thereof[.]

Item 8 requires that directors must “furnish such additional information, if any, as may be necessary to make the required statements, in light of the circumstances under which they are made, not materially misleading.”

60. The Solicitation Statement violates Section 14(d)(4) and Rule 14d-9 because it omits the material facts set forth above, which renders the Solicitation Statement false and/or misleading.

61. Defendants knowingly or with deliberate recklessness omitted the material information set forth above, causing statements therein to be materially incomplete and misleading.

62. The omissions in the Solicitation Statement are material to plaintiff and the Class, and they will be deprived of their entitlement to make a fully informed decision with respect to the Proposed Transaction if such misrepresentations and omissions are not corrected prior to the expiration of the tender offer.

63. Plaintiff and the Class have no adequate remedy at law.

COUNT III

**(Claim for Violation of Section 20(a) of the 1934 Act
Against the Individual Defendants and Duravant)**

64. Plaintiff repeats and realleges the preceding allegations as if fully set forth herein.

65. The Individual Defendants and Duravant acted as controlling persons of Key Technology within the meaning of Section 20(a) of the 1934 Act as alleged herein. By virtue of their positions as officers and/or directors of Key Technology and participation in and/or awareness of the Company's operations and/or intimate knowledge of the false statements contained in the Solicitation Statement filed with the SEC, they had the power to influence and control and did influence and control, directly or indirectly, the decision making of the Company, including the content and dissemination of the various statements that plaintiff contends are false and misleading.

66. Each of the Individual Defendants and Duravant was provided with or had unlimited access to copies of the Solicitation Statement alleged by plaintiff to be misleading prior to and/or shortly after these statements were issued and had the ability to prevent the issuance of the statements or cause them to be corrected.

67. In particular, each of the Individual Defendants had direct and supervisory involvement in the day-to-day operations of the Company, and, therefore, is presumed to have had the power to control and influence the particular transactions giving rise to the violations as alleged herein, and exercised the same. The Solicitation Statement contains the unanimous recommendation of the Individual Defendants to approve the Proposed Transaction. They were thus directly connected with and involved in the making of the Solicitation Statement.

68. Duravant also had direct supervisory control over the composition of the Solicitation Statement and the information disclosed therein, as well as the information

1 that was omitted and/or misrepresented in the Solicitation Statement.

2 69. By virtue of the foregoing, the Individual Defendants and Duravant
3 violated Section 20(a) of the 1934 Act.

4 70. As set forth above, the Individual Defendants and Duravant had the
5 ability to exercise control over and did control a person or persons who have each
6 violated Section 14(e) of the 1934 Act and Rule 14a-9, by their acts and omissions as
7 alleged herein. By virtue of their positions as controlling persons, these defendants
8 are liable pursuant to Section 20(a) of the 1934 Act.

9 71. As a direct and proximate result of defendants' conduct, plaintiff and the
10 Class are threatened with irreparable harm.

11 72. Plaintiff and the Class have no adequate remedy at law.

12 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

13 WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays for judgment and relief as follows:

14 A. Enjoining defendants and all persons acting in concert with them from
15 proceeding with, consummating, or closing the Proposed Transaction;

16 B. In the event defendants consummate the Proposed Transaction,
17 rescinding it and setting it aside or awarding rescissory damages;

18 C. Directing the Individual Defendants to file a Solicitation Statement that
19 does not contain any untrue statements of material fact and that states all material
20 facts required in it or necessary to make the statements contained therein not
21 misleading;

22 D. Declaring that defendants violated Sections 14(e), 14(d), and 20(a) of the
23 1934 Act, as well as Rule 14a-9 promulgated thereunder;

24 E. Awarding plaintiff the costs of this action, including reasonable allowance
25 for plaintiff's attorneys' and experts' fees; and

26 F. Granting such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and
27 proper.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury.

DATED this 15th day of February, 2018.

BRESKIN JOHNSON & TOWNSEND, PLLC

By: /s/ Roger Townsend

Roger Townsend, WSBA # 25525

1000 Second Avenue, Suite 3670

Seattle, Washington 98104

206-652-8660 Phone

206-652-8290 Fax

rtownsend@bjtlegal.com

OF COUNSEL:

RIGRODSKY & LONG, P.A.

300 Delaware Avenue

Suite 1220

Wilmington, DE 19801

302-295-5310

Attorneys for Plaintiff